

HOME-TO-JOB AND JOB-TO-HOME SPILLOVER: The Impact of Company Policies and Workplace Culture

Sue Falter Mennino*

Loyola University at New Orleans

Beth A. Rubin

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

April Brayfield

Tulane University

We draw on gender theory and neo-institutional theory to examine the impact of workplace characteristics and family demands on negative job-to-home and home-to-job spillover. Our multivariate analyses of the 1997 *National Study of the Changing Workforce* data indicate that family-supportive workplace cultures reduce negative spillover in both directions, whereas the availability of company policies, such as dependent care benefits and flextime, do not. Our results also show that family demands increase spillover more for women than for men. Our findings suggest that the atmosphere of the workplace is more important than the availability of company policies in reducing negative spillover.

Ever since Kanter (1977) debunked the myth of separate spheres for work¹ and family, researchers have been examining the nature and extent of the job–family interface. One facet of this interface is the spillover from one domain to the other, whereby experiences in one domain moderate the experiences in the other (Barnett 1994). Spillover conceptually represents the process whereby behaviors, moods, stress, and emotions from one realm of social life affect those in another and vice versa (Williams and Alliger 1994; Frone, Yardley, and Markel 1997).

Spillover can be positive, but our concern is with the negative spillover, or work–family conflict, people experience while trying to balance a job and family in contemporary society (Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999; Grzywacz, Almeida, and McDonald 2002; Schieman, McBrier, and Van Gundy 2003). Negative spillover occurs when demands from the two domains of job and home compete for an individual's time, energy, and attention (Small and Riley 1990). For example, a worker whose child or elderly parent is ill may be less able to concentrate on the job. Similarly, a worker who is facing a tight deadline at work might have less time to help a child with homework or

An earlier version of this article was presented at the 96th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association in Anaheim, CA, 2001.

*Direct all correspondence to Sue Falter Mennino, Department of Sociology, Campus Box 30, Loyola University, New Orleans, LA 70118; e-mail: smennino@tulanealumni.net

tend to a leaky roof. This balancing act is likely to become increasingly difficult as businesses attempt to maintain their profitability in the competitive 24/7 global economy, and as the workplace becomes more of a “greedy institution” (Coser 1974; Epstein et al. 1999). Workplaces impinge further and further into peoples’ lives, but offer less financial and occupational stability. In so doing they aggravate employment-related problems such as stress, turnover, and lowered commitment as employees struggle to reconcile increased demands with diminishing resources of time (Rubin 1996; Rubin and Brody 2002).

We use gender theory to guide our analysis of the spillover between job and home life. This theory defines gender as a structure, with established patterns of expected behaviors that constrain individuals (Connell 1987; Lorber 1994; Risman 1998; Martin 2003). The roots of the gender structure lie in the gendered division of labor in society. With the advent of industrialization, work not only became divided into the separate spheres of market work for men and domestic work for women, it also became hierarchically arranged, with (male) market work taking precedence over (female) domestic work (Acker 1990; Ferree 1990; Kelly 1999; Glass 2000). We will argue that, despite some advances in gender equity during the past few decades, the ideology of gendered separate spheres sustains inequalities in two ways. First, the preponderance of this ideology maintains an inequality between women and men, who do not share equally in the work of household maintenance and childrearing in the domestic sphere, nor do they share equally in the responsibilities and rewards in the public sphere. Second, this ideology also maintains the primacy of market work over domestic work—for both women and men—by rewarding employees who seem most committed to their jobs and who do not appear to allow family obligations to infringe on that commitment.

Gender theory illustrates how the public and private spheres of work are gendered in the sense that they are ideologically separate and unequal *regardless of the gender of the role incumbents*. Because market work is masculinized (Acker 1990; Collinson and Hearn 1994; Martin 2003) and because masculinity holds greater value than femininity (Scott 1986; Foster 1999; Kelly 1999), market work is valued over domestic work. For example, those who achieve the highest workplace success are those who practice masculinity (Wajcman 1999) not only by engaging in practices and behaviors culturally associated with masculinity but more so by prioritizing market work over domestic work (Martin 2003). Achieving job–family integration thus requires a collective ideological shift away from gendered separate spheres (Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999; Kelly 1999; Bowen 2000; Gerson 2000; Glass 2000); understanding the mechanisms that affect job-to-home spillover is a step in that direction. Gender theory allows us to study the social structure of gender by separating the gender of specific social roles from the gender of the occupants of those roles (Ferree 1990) and by separating the gender of each work sphere from the gender of the participants in those spheres.

Gender theory, however, does not adequately explain why the availability of formal family-friendly policies does not reduce negative spillover. Companies have implemented a host of such policies that should gradually degender the workplace by facilitating the integration of job and home life for both women and men. As competitive pressures put

increasing demands on companies to retain highly productive workers, companies can ill afford the decreased commitment and increased stress that chronic negative spillover can create, both of which research shows decrease overall productivity (Kirchmeyer 1993; Meyer and Allen 1997). Likewise, employers can ill afford the loss of talented labor that the absence of family-friendly policies might cause. Hence, employers often establish formal company policies, particularly flexible working arrangements, to alleviate these problems (Allen 2001). Child care benefits and flextime, in particular, have emerged as cost-effective ways to attract and keep valuable employees, especially women (Goodstein 1994; Osterman 1995; Witkowski 1999).

While the existence of such policies may increase the attractiveness of the employer to potential and incumbent employees, the usefulness of these policies in reducing negative spillover is questionable. Employees often assume that despite a formal structure of family-friendly policies, actually invoking them will result in curtailed career trajectories (Kossek, Barber, and Winters 1999; Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness 1999). There is mounting evidence that the *culture* of a workplace, more so than the availability of work-family policies, is more likely to affect an employee's ability to effectively manage a job and a family (Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman 1996; Thompson et al. 1999; Allen 2001). Family-friendly cultures are found in work organizations with environments that are universally supportive of job-family integration. Since cultures carry taken-for-granted assumptions and normative expectations for behavior, we also use neo-institutional theory to examine the effects of both the formal policies and the informal norms of workplace organizations on negative spillover since this theory addresses such issues directly.

Neo-institutional theory is particularly useful for understanding such slippage between organizational policies and practices. This theory has a variety of goals (DiMaggio and Powell 1991)² but most generally examine the relationship between organizations and their environments to make sense of socially constructed organizational practices. For example, within neo-institutional theory, the presence of family-friendly policies can be explained not only in the aforementioned economic terms, that is, preserving and in recruiting talented labor, but also as a response to memetic pressures to maintain legitimacy within organizational fields in which incorporating family-friendly policies is normative. The particular project of neo-institutional analysis that is of relevance here is the examination and explanation of the gap between organizational reality and the formal accounts of that reality (Meyer and Rowan 1977; DiMaggio and Powell 1991). For these insights, we turn to the more microcomponents of neo-institutional theory that focus on the interactive and cultural components of organizational life.

These aspects of neo-institutional theory point us to the basic observation that social relations, both within and outside of organizations, are reproduced through everyday interaction, and these interactions, in conjunction with formal rules and procedures, shape the behavior of individuals in organizations (Meyer and Rowan 1977; DiMaggio and Powell 1991; Zucker 1991). A key insight of neo-institutionalism is that institutions, such as gendered separate spheres, are associated with standardized behaviors, activities, and expectations containing taken-for-granted rationales (Jepperson 1991). Thus, inas-

much as separate spheres ideology has been institutionalized in organizational structures and practices, simply creating “family-friendly” policies is insufficient for reducing spillover. In order for family-friendly policies to have that outcome, they would need to become part of the taken-for-grantedness of organizational life.

In other words, if the strict separation of home and the workplace is the normalized interactional pattern within a workplace, formal company policies that challenge that assumption will be ineffective. In addition, the success of such policies depends on two prerequisites: they must be equally available to male as well as female workers, and those who use the policies must not suffer any deleterious consequences.

Neo-institutional theory, combined with gender theory, improves on the more frequently used role theory in prior spillover research (e.g., Gutek, Searle, and Klepa 1991; Duxbury, Higgins, and Lee 1994; Schieman et al. 2003). Although gendered social roles are a vital piece of the work–family puzzle, role theory alone offers an incomplete explanation of negative spillover between the job and home because it relies primarily on biological differences and childhood socialization to explain gender differences. Similarly, it ignores the power differential inherent in the gender structure (Connell 1987; Ferree 1990; Risman 1998). Our study focuses on the social roles of paid worker and family member, but goes beyond much of the previous research. We do so by combining gender theory with neo-institutional theory. We examine the relationships among the formal structures of work organizations and the taken-for-granted expectations about work and family to explain the persistence of negative spillover even in the presence of family-friendly policies. We contend, along with others (e.g., Barnett 1999; Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999), that a sociological understanding of the job–family interface entails a multidimensional analytic lens that examines not only individuals and organizations, but also includes ideologies about work and family that are the deeply held beliefs of individuals and components of organizational culture. Toward these objectives, we use data from the 1997 *National Study of the Changing Workforce* (NSCW) (Bond, Galinsky, and Swanberg 1998) to investigate how company policies and cultures, along with job characteristics and family configurations, together influence negative home-to-job and job-to-home spillover.

DETERMINANTS OF NEGATIVE SPILLOVER

Gender theory treats gender as a social structure that is concurrently part of our individual identity and part of the organizational schema of institutions that are maintained by daily interactions between individuals (Lorber 1994; Ridgeway 1997; Risman 1998). Neo-institutional theory explains why it is quite difficult to challenge the gender system with formal company policies once that system has become part of normative interactional patterns in workplaces. We argue that job-to-home and home-to-job spillover for women and men is determined dynamically and simultaneously not only by a person’s sex, individual household, and job circumstances, but more so by the larger gender system that is institutionalized within the family, the workplace, and the economy. In this section we develop research hypotheses about these relationships.

Gender of the Individual

Perhaps the first question about spillover is: To what degree do the causes and consequences of spillover differ for women and men? Despite a trend toward more egalitarian attitudes about gender behavior (Thornton 1989), both women and men gravitate toward a traditional division of labor in the home, especially if they have children (Sanchez and Thomson 1997; Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000). Even though most women contribute to the family income and many men help out with the housework and child care, women and men strive to maintain the traditional identities of women as primary family caregivers and men as breadwinners, for themselves as well as for their partners (Potuchek 1997; Deutsch and Saxon 1998). These behavioral patterns, in turn, contribute to the maintenance of traditional gender ideology whereby women often are more involved than men in the home sphere (Thompson and Walker 1989; Risman 1998). As a result, women and men may very well experience and report spillover differently.

The findings on the spillover differences between women and men are inconsistent in this regard. Some researchers find that women and men experience similar levels of spillover (Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992; Barnett 1994; Eagle, Miles, and Icenogle 1997), and a few find differences between women and men either only in one direction or only under certain conditions (Gutek et al. 1991; Duxbury et al. 1994; Gignac, Kelloway, and Gottlieb 1996). Nevertheless, several researchers find that women report higher levels of spillover than do men, especially home-to-job spillover (Duxbury and Higgins 1994; Kirchmeyer 1995). Because of the preponderance of traditional gender ideology, women may take more responsibility for work in the home and be more aware of the ways in which employment encroaches on family life. Accordingly, we expect that women will experience higher levels of spillover in both directions than will men.

Family-Friendly Company Policies

Many companies today are striving to appear more family friendly, usually to increase employee productivity and to reduce employee turnover costs (Witkowski 1999). Toward this end, employers have developed a variety of policies that include such things as support for dependent care in the form of referral services for child or elder care, cash subsidies, pretax salary set-asides, and, less frequently, on-site or near-site child care centers (Galinsky and Stein 1990; Ferber, O'Farrell, and Allen 1991; Kelly 1999). In addition, the temporal and spatial structures of work reflect a company's potential family-friendliness. Flexible working arrangements such as flextime, job-sharing, and work-at-home policies are some of the initiatives that both employees and employers consider to be family-friendly (Wiatrowski 1990; Kelly 1999). Of course, flexible employment policies are often as much about facilitating employers' flexible deployment of labor as they are about facilitating employee's flexible use of time (Harrison 1994; Rubin 1995; Vallas 1999). Thus, companies use temporary or part-time employment to increase their competitiveness and create flexibility regardless of employees' preferences.³ When flexibility takes this form, it often increases the problems of resolving the tensions between the demands of home and family since irregular schedules can make resolving the pressures between home and work even more difficult.

Despite these caveats, research points to the family-friendly policies as mutually beneficial for employers and employees. Employees in companies that offer dependent benefits and flexible working options report lower absenteeism and tardiness rates, higher morale, higher job satisfaction, higher employer loyalty, and lower turnover rates (Galinsky and Stein 1990; Thompson et al. 1999; Roehling, Roehling, and Moen 2001). While beneficial in a number of ways, it is unclear whether these specific policies reduce negative spillover. Some studies show that the availability of family benefits (Thompson et al. 1999) and flexible scheduling (Thomas and Ganster 1995) reduce job-to-home spillover; other studies provide evidence that they do not (Warren and Johnson 1995; Galinsky et al. 1996).

Part of the inconsistency in results may reflect the gender-specific impact of the effects. The persistence of gendered expectations for women's versus men's homemaking responsibilities, as well as women's increased participation at all levels of the labor market, suggests that family-friendly policies are often geared toward attracting and retaining desirable female workers rather than reflecting employers' genuine efforts to alleviate tension between home and job responsibilities (Wiatrowski 1990; Kelly 1999; Witkowski 1999).

Consistent with these gendered status expectations (Ridgeway 1997), empirical evidence demonstrates that both women and men in the workplace perceive family-friendly policies as women's policies and women are, in fact, more likely than men to use such policies (Sandberg 1999; Thompson et al. 1999; Gerstel and Clawson 2001). Moreover, companies who have more female employees are more likely than other companies to offer such policies (Goodstein 1994; Osterman 1995). There is little empirical support, however, to demonstrate that the availability of family-friendly policies successfully reduces spillover for either women or men. Accordingly, because of the prevalence and persistence of the separate spheres ideology with its integral valorization of work over the domestic sphere, and the power of normative expectations to shape behaviors in the workplace, we expect that the availability of family-friendly policies will have *no* effect on negative spillover for either women or men.

Workplace Environment

Neo-institutional theory suggests that workplace culture encompasses far more than employment practices. It includes the informal rules about how relationships "should be structured" (Fligstein 2001). The shared set of beliefs about the norms, values, and goals of an organization comprise workplace culture and its informal structure (Gherardi 1994). The norms about interactions, including, we argue, those surrounding workplace and family roles, lead to routinized and stable outcomes (Meyer and Rowan 1977; DiMaggio and Powell 1983). The assumptions about the relationship of family to the workplace, then, are an integral component of workplace culture.

Inasmuch as workplace practices become embedded in the normative expectations associated with the employing organization, they become taken for granted; the informal environment of an organization reflects that culture. For example, the unspoken assumption in an organization that employees leave their family at the door reflects the family-

unfriendly norm of separate spheres. Conversely, an organization where most of the employees routinely take time during regular work hours to tend to family or personal matters with no fear of reprisal demonstrates a more family-friendly workplace culture.

Only a few researchers have evaluated the relationship between workplace culture and spillover and these have tested spillover in only one direction. These studies consistently demonstrate that a supportive workplace culture reduces job-to-home spillover (Warren and Johnson 1995; Galinsky et al. 1996; Thompson et al. 1999). These results are consistent with the neo-institutional arguments that cultures “carry” rules, procedures, and goals that are institutionalized, but not necessarily represented in the policies of a formal organization (Jepperson 1991:150). Accordingly, we test the hypothesis that the culture of a workplace, despite the existence of formal company policies, is the strongest influence on an individual’s ability to successfully balance job and home responsibilities.

Workplace environment also includes the conditions of the job itself. Research demonstrates that particular job characteristics also affect spillover. Workers in high-pressure jobs, whether the pressure stems from long hours, a professional position, or unrelenting demands from employers, often experience greater job-to-home spillover than do other workers (Gutek et al. 1991; Frone et al. 1992; Duxbury and Higgins 1994). Well-paid professional jobs are often the most stressful, requiring not only additional time but also a priority commitment from the worker (Perlow 1997; Rones, Ilg, and Garner 1997; Perlow 1998). Job pressures are not restricted to professional jobs; most employees who feel that they must work hard, work fast, and constantly learn new things also feel enormous job pressures (Rubin 1996; Vallas 1999). Generally, employees in many occupations are working longer hours than ever before (Rones et al. 1997). There is growing evidence, however, that these long hours are not always a result of increased job demands, but rather emerge out of “time-demanding” organizational cultures that valorize long hours and reward those workers who are willing to sustain them (Perlow 1997; Epstein et al. 1999; Rubin and Brody 2002). This tendency is likely to increase the extent of negative spillover.

The pressures of demanding jobs are accompanied and reinforced by gendered beliefs about the appropriate priorities of the occupants of such positions. That is, given the persistent ideology of gendered separate spheres, all workers, especially those who fill the highly compensated professional positions, are expected to behave as traditional male breadwinners and prioritize workplace demands over family demands, regardless of their actual sex or family situation (Collinson and Collinson 1997; Epstein et al. 1999). We therefore expect that both women and men with demanding jobs will experience the highest levels of negative spillover.

Family Characteristics

Researchers generally find that greater family demands cause higher levels of home-to-job spillover (Crouter 1984; Gignac et al. 1996). Workers with greater household responsibilities carry over more of those responsibilities into the workplace (Gutek et al. 1991). For example, workers can be distracted by family concerns while on the job, be too tired from doing things for the family to concentrate on the job, or spend time at work taking

care of family duties. Not surprisingly, having a spouse or partner and/or children at home adds complexity to a worker's family life, especially for women. Although women and men may share household responsibilities more today than in the past, people tend to exhibit the more traditional behavior of male-breadwinner and female-caregiver in the context of couples and/or parenting relationships (South and Spitze 1994; Sanchez and Thomson 1997). Thus, because coupling and parenting seem to invoke gendered status expectations, we anticipate that workers with a partner and/or children, especially women in those situations, will experience higher levels of home-to-job spillover than will other workers.

METHODS

Data and Sample

We use data from the *1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce* (NSCW) (Bond et al. 1998). The NSCW surveyed 3,718 respondents, a national cross-sectional probability sample of 3,381 employed women and men ages 18 through 64 and 337 women who had dependent children who were not in the labor force. For this analysis, we selected only wage and salaried workers ($N = 2,877$); we eliminated respondents who reported being self-employed because of our interest in the influence of company policies and supervisors on job-to-home spillover. We assume that those who are self-employed do not have supervisors and may also have more influence on the type of company policies available to them. We also deleted respondents with missing data on any of the independent or dependent variables, resulting in a final sample size of 2,334: 1,245 women (53.3 percent) and 1,089 men (46.7 percent).⁴

Measures

Appendix A summarizes the measurement details for all variables in the analysis. We examine two dependent variables: home-to-job spillover and job-to-home spillover. For the items that comprise both of these additive indices, the response categories range from 1 *never* to 5 *very often*; higher scores indicate higher levels of negative home-to-job and job-to-home spillover.⁵

For the independent variables, we focus primarily on workplace characteristics, both the formal policies offered by the employer and the culture of the workplace. We include two measures of formal employer policies: an index of dependent care benefits available to the respondent from the employer and an indicator of flextime availability.

We use several variables to measure workplace culture. First, we use a variable that indicates whether the respondent's supervisor is supportive about family matters. Studies consistently find that workers with supervisors who are sympathetic about family and personal matters report lower levels of spillover (Thomas and Ganster 1995; Warren and Johnson 1995; Galinsky et al. 1996; Frone et al. 1997; Kossek and Ozeki 1998). Second, we use an index measuring the employee's perception of the family-friendliness of the workplace environment. A family-supportive workplace environment, that is, one with normative expectations that allow employees to balance job and family responsibilities, also

reduces job-home conflict (Galinsky and Stein 1990; Warren and Johnson 1995; Thompson et al. 1999).

Several facets of a workplace environment can negatively affect its family-friendliness, for example, expectations regarding work priority over family, perceived damaging career consequences, and employer insensitivity to employee's family responsibilities (Thompson et al. 1999). As another measure of the workplace culture, we include an indicator of how easy it is for employees to take time during the day to attend to family matters at the respondent's workplace. Finally, in this era of economic uncertainty and tenuous job security, many may fear losing their jobs and anxiety may be part of the climate or culture of a workplace (Rubin and Smith 2001; Rubin and Brody 2002). Thus, we also use an indicator of the respondent's feeling of job security.

Workplace culture is one facet of the employee's workplace experience; another is the employee's job itself. We include several variables that measure aspects of the respondent's job. These are the respondent's occupational group, an indicator of the job's exempt status, an indicator of the respondent's perception of time demands on the job, and an index of the amount of autonomy reported by the respondent.

Previous research suggests that there is a difference in spillover levels between workers in different occupational groups. For example, white-collar workers experience higher levels of job-to-home spillover but lower levels of home-to-job spillover than do blue-collar workers (Frone et al. 1992). Similarly, workers in managerial or professional positions report higher levels of job-to-family spillover than do workers in other occupations (Duxbury and Higgins 1994). Whether an employee's job is exempt or nonexempt, however, may also have important implications for spillover. Because exempt employees are not limited by labor legislation as to the amount of time their employers can require them to work, the boundary between employment and home is often less defined for exempt employees than for nonexempt employees (Perlow 1997; Jacobs and Gerson 1998). Thus, we categorize occupations in two ways: by occupational group (executive, administrative, managerial, and professional; technical; sales; administrative support; service; and production, operation, and repair) and by exempt status.

We include a measure of employees' subjective assessment of the time pressures associated with their job. Time pressure on the job, or the feeling of not having enough time to get everything done, is associated with increased feelings of job-family stress (Perlow 1997).

The amount of control people have in their jobs also influences negative spillover. Having the ability to choose when and how a task is completed is an important factor in controlling job-family stress (Duxbury et al. 1994; Edwards and Rothbard 1999). In addition, we use the calculated total weekly hours worked by the respondent, which is the sum of the number of paid hours respondents usually work at their main job, the number of paid and unpaid overtime hours at their main job, and the number of hours respondents usually work at other jobs, if any.

Finally, we include a measure of the respondent's job satisfaction because satisfaction with one's job can mitigate negative job-family spillover (Kossek and Ozeki 1998) and dissatisfaction can increase job-to-home spillover (Gignac et al. 1996).

In addition to workplace and job characteristics, an employee's household configuration can also affect negative spillover. We include in our models three variables that measure different characteristics of the respondent's household. These variables are the respondent's household income, whether the respondent is part of a couple, and the total number of children in the household classified into three age groups (under 6, 6 through 12, and 13 through 17). We classify a respondent as part of a couple if the respondent is either married or reports living with a partner in a committed relationship.⁶ We also control for respondent's age and level of education.

FINDINGS

Consistent with gender theory, we find that, overall, negative job-to-home spillover ($\bar{X} = 14.7$) is more extensive than negative home-to-job spillover ($\bar{X} = 9.7$; $t = -51.832$, $p < .000$).⁷ This finding illustrates the primacy society gives to the workplace over the family (Daniels 1987; Kelly 1999; Ciscel, Sharp, and Heath 2000; Glass 2000). Home-to-job spillover occurs less often than job-to-home spillover because, as gender theory predicts, workers as well as the workplace itself allow fewer intrusions from the home into the workplace; workers adjust their family lives around their jobs rather than vice versa.

Table 1 reveals several noteworthy sample characteristics. Not surprisingly, since women typically take on more of the family caregiving responsibilities than do men, women report slightly higher levels of both types of spillover than do men. Interestingly, there are no differences between women and men on several important employment characteristics, including particular occupational categories, time pressure, job satisfaction, and job security. Women and men are equally likely to have dependent benefits available and a supportive supervisor. Men, however, work longer hours and have more job autonomy and flextime availability while women have more supportive workplace cultures. Women and men differ in ways other than employment characteristics. Male respondents are more likely than are female respondents to live with a partner and to have more children under age 6. Male respondents also live in households with higher incomes and have more education than do women.

We use Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression to examine the influence of the independent variables on job-to-home and home-to-job spillover. Although some of our variables are moderately correlated (see Appendix B), multicollinearity is not a problem. To control for any difference between respondents who were missing income data, we include a missing-data indicator for household income.

The multivariate results present a somewhat different picture of the estimated relationships than do the bivariate results, especially the differences between women and men, and thus we focus our discussion on the regression equations. Overall, our findings show that time pressure on the job is the greatest cause of negative spillover in both directions, as indicated by the standardized coefficients. Moreover, job-to-home spillover is aggravated by the sheer number of hours people spend on the job. Having a domestic partner at home also increases job-to-home spillover, as does having more children in each age group, but to a much lesser extent than time pressure and time commitment.

TABLE 1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Dependent and Independent Variables by Sex of Respondent

Variables	Women (N = 1,245)		Men (N = 1,089)		t-ratio ^a
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Home-to-job spillover	9.83	3.32	9.55	3.44	-1.99*
Job-to-home spillover	14.84	4.88	14.45	4.83	-1.95*
<i>Controls</i>					
Age	40.87	11.94	39.01	11.17	-3.87***
<i>Education</i>					
High school or less	.34	.47	.36	.48	.99
Some college	.36	.48	.29	.45	-3.58***
Four-year degree or higher	.30	.46	.35	.48	2.58**
<i>Job characteristics</i>					
<i>Occupation</i>					
Executive/administrative/ managerial	.16	.36	.17	.37	.67
Professional	.21	.41	.16	.37	-2.70**
Technical	.06	.23	.04	.20	-1.39
Sales	.12	.32	.11	.31	-.89
Administrative support	.25	.43	.06	.23	-13.54***
Service	.12	.32	.09	.29	-2.07*
Production/operation/repair	.09	.30	.37	.48	16.22***
Exempt job position	.38	.48	.37	.48	-.19
Hours worked per week	43.04	12.68	49.56	13.66	11.95***
Never enough time	2.77	1.16	2.79	1.10	.50
Job autonomy	2.96	.74	3.09	.73	4.08***
Job satisfaction	3.36	.70	3.23	.70	1.17
<i>Family characteristics</i>					
Household income	51,113.61	51,688.17	59,772.32	65,571.46	3.51***
Couple	.57	.50	.67	.47	4.82***
Children under 6	.20	.50	.32	.64	4.79***
Children 6-12	.33	.65	.35	.68	.90
Children 13-17	.27	.59	.23	.55	-1.53
<i>Company policies</i>					
Dependent care benefits	1.20	.26	1.20	.27	-.04
Flextime available	.42	.49	.46	.50	1.97*
<i>Workplace culture</i>					
Supervisor support regarding family	3.35	.72	3.31	.69	-1.54
Family supportive environment	3.02	.78	2.95	.75	-2.48**
Easy to take time for family	2.82	1.01	2.90	1.00	-1.82
Frequent layoffs	.10	.30	.10	.30	.01

^aDifference between women's and men's means.

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

Conversely, being satisfied with one's job strongly decreases spillover in both directions. Moreover, the findings illustrate the powerful effect that an authentically family-friendly workplace culture has on negative spillover. A supportive environment and being able to take time during the day to attend to family matters are vital factors in reducing spillover from job to home.

Net of other effects, women experience far greater levels of job-to-home spillover than do men, and this net gender difference (Table 2) is notably much greater than the initial baseline difference (Table 1) after other factors, including workplace controls, are taken into account. Yet there is no significant difference between women and men in home-to-job spillover. This finding may be attributed to the limited occurrence of home-to-job spillover and, as we will clarify, may be better explained by factors other than individual sex.

As predicted, family policies have no effect on spillover in either direction.⁸ Therefore, the availability of such policies alone does not matter as much as other workplace factors, such as the ability to take advantage of the policies without fear of reprisals.⁹

The results generally support our prediction about workplace culture. Having a supervisor who is supportive about family issues lowers job-to-home spillover. Working in an organization with a supportive environment and one in which it is easy to take time during the day to attend to family matters lowers spillover in both directions. In contrast, the possibility of frequent layoffs increases job-to-home spillover, but has no net effect on home-to-job spillover.

As others have argued, and we concur, making job-family issues visible in the workplace by acknowledging that they are not individual problems but rather social issues that affect workplaces is a necessary facet of a workplace culture that alleviates negative spillover (Barnett 1999; Gerson 2000; Glass 2000). Similarly, our findings demonstrate the supremacy of *informal* over formal attributes of the organization in affecting the negative spillover between home and workplace.

Just as workplace characteristics affect spillover, so do job characteristics. As mentioned earlier, the evidence about the effect of job demands relative to other job characteristics on the two types of spillover is partially supportive of our hypotheses. Working long hours, feeling time pressure on the job, and having little autonomy all contribute to job-to-home spillover, but only feeling time pressure on the job increases the negative spillover from home to job. Being satisfied with one's job decreases both types of spillover.

Contrary to our prediction, however, the type of occupation only affects job-to-home spillover. Executives and managers experience more job-to-home spillover than do service workers. There are no other differences in spillover between executives and managers and other occupational groups.

We find mixed support for our predictions about the demands of family circumstances. Not surprisingly, workers with more children in all age groups experience higher levels of both home-to-job and job-to-home spillover than do other workers. Having a partner at home, however, affects only job-to-home spillover.

Both of our control variables achieved statistical significance. Older people experience higher levels of job-to-home spillover than do younger people, perhaps because they

TABLE 2. Ordinary Least Squares Regression Equations for Spillover Models

Variable	Home-to-Job Spillover			Job-to-Home Spillover		
	b	S.E.	β	b	S.E.	β
Woman	.254	(.151)	.038	.963	(.191)***	.099
<i>Controls</i>						
Age	-.016	(.006)*	-.054	-.031	(.008)***	-.074
Education (High school or less)						
Some college	.012	(.169)	.002	-.094	(.214)	-.009
Four-year degree or more	.476	(.208)*	.066	.550	(.263)*	.053
<i>Job characteristics</i>						
Occupation (Executive/managerial)						
Professional	.337	(.233)	.039	-.406	(.295)	-.033
Technical	-.410	(.355)	-.026	.044	(.450)	.002
Sales	-.004	(.272)	-.004	-.227	(.344)	-.015
Administrative support	.216	(.258)	.023	-.027	(.326)	-.002
Service	-.234	(.292)	-.021	-.750	(.370)*	-.047
Production/operation/repair	-.289	(.261)	-.036	-.141	(.330)	-.012
Exempt job position	.133	(.166)	.019	.400	(.211)	.040
Hours worked per week	-.005	(.005)	-.021	.059	(.007)***	.165
Never enough time	.536	(.063)***	.180	.922	(.080)***	.216
Job autonomy	.112	(.105)	.025	-.335	(.133)*	-.051
Job satisfaction	-.218	(.092)*	-.056	-.726	(.116)***	-.130
<i>Family characteristics</i>						
Household income ^a	.021	(.120)	.036	-.007	(.150)	-.008
Missing income	-.207	(.306)	-.013	-.327	(.388)	-.015
Couple	-.254	(.150)	-.037	.509	(.190)**	.051
Children under 6	.517	(.125)***	.088	.397	(.159)**	.047
Children 6–12	.306	(.104)**	.060	.424	(.131)***	.058
Children 13–17	.355	(.119)**	.060	.468	(.151)**	.055
<i>Company policies</i>						
Dependent care benefits availability	.019	(.259)	.002	-.344	(.327)	-.019
Flextime available	.024	(.147)	.003	.010	(.186)	.001
<i>Workplace culture</i>						
Supervisor support regarding family	-.088	(.118)	-.018	-.423	(.149)**	-.061
Family supportive environment	-.473	(.103)***	-.107	-.667	(.131)***	-.105
Easy to take time for family	-.247	(.077)**	-.073	-.941	(.097)***	-.195
Frequent layoffs	.410	(.229)	.037	1.768	(.288)**	.048
Intercept		10.474***			16.815***	
Adjusted R ²		.108***			.303***	

Note: N = 2,334. For polytomous categorical variables, the reference category is in parentheses.

^aIncome coefficients multiplied by 10,000.

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

may have more responsibilities in both the workplace and at home than younger people. Finally, having at least a four-year college degree increases spillover in both directions.

Taken together, the model explains a much greater percentage of the variance in job-to-home spillover (30 percent) than the variance in home-to-job spillover (11 percent). Undoubtedly, family characteristics other than couple status and number of children, such as the health of family members and care responsibilities for family members residing outside the household, are far more important than these particular workplace characteristics in determining how family life may spill over into the job domain. Several of the variables, however, approach statistical significance in the home-to-job spillover model. These are being female, fear of layoffs, and being single.

Because the models fail to fully explain why women experience higher levels of negative spillover between the workplace and home than do men, we estimated separate models for women and men to further investigate the effect of individual sex on spillover.¹⁰ Table 3 presents models for home-to-job spillover; Table 4 presents models for job-to-home spillover.

Table 3 reveals that most of the same characteristics affect home-to-job spillover in the same ways for women and men, as illustrated by the Z scores. Time pressure on the job is the leading cause of negative home-to-job spillover for both women and men. Having more children under age 6 and more children ages 6 through 12 also increase home-to-job spillover for women and for men. A supportive environment and satisfaction with one's job both help to alleviate home-to-job spillover for both women and men. None of the following variables affect home-to-job spillover for either women or men: occupation type, having an exempt job, working long hours, household income, the availability of dependent care benefits or flextime, level of supervisor support, and fear of layoffs.

Table 3 also reveals some differences between women and men in their experience of negative spillover. For women but not for men, having more teenagers and being younger increases home-to-job spillover but being more satisfied with their jobs decreases it. For men only, those with at least a college degree experience higher levels of spillover. Interestingly, having a job in a workplace where it is easy to take time during the day to attend to family helps to lower home-to-job spillover for men but not for women.

We compared the male and female coefficients to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between them (Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou 1995). As the Z scores in Table 3 indicate, only job autonomy affects women and men in different ways. Having more job autonomy increases negative home-to-job spillover for men whereas it decreases it for women, although this effect is not significant for women. This unexpected finding illustrates the discrepancy between having more job autonomy, as the men in this study do, and increasing demands on men to be more involved in domestic responsibilities. These combined pressures can only lead to more spillover between home and the workplace unless institutional support is present (Gerson 2002). The separate models explain a similar but small amount of the variance in home-to-job spillover, 11 percent for women and 10 percent for men. In addition, the Chow test F-ratio¹¹ indicates that the predictors have a similar influence on home-to-job spillover for women and men.

TABLE 3. Ordinary Least Squares Standardized Regression Coefficients Predicting Negative Job-to-Home Spillover, by Sex of Respondent

Variable	Women (N = 1,245)			Men (N = 1,089)			Z
	b	S.E.	β	b	S.E.	β	
<i>Controls</i>							
Age	-.020	(.008)*	-.071	-.006	(.010)	-.020	1.09
Education (High school or less)							
Some college	-.060	(.226)	-.009	.080	(.258)	.011	-.06
Four-year degree or more	.211	(.287)	.029	.746	(.310)*	.103	1.27
<i>Job characteristics</i>							
Occupation (Executive/managerial)							
Professional	.347	(.315)	.042	.373	(.354)	.040	.05
Technical	-.405	(.462)	-.027	-.322	(.564)	-.019	.11
Sales	-.216	(.373)	-.021	.088	(.402)	.008	.23
Administrative support	.099	(.313)	.013	.613	(.515)	.041	1.18
Service	-.401	(.386)	-.039	.011	(.457)	.001	.65
Production/operation/repair	-.111	(.406)	-.010	-.204	(.371)	-.029	-.17
Exempt job position	.322	(.224)	.047	-.051	(.254)	-.007	-1.10
Hours worked per week	-.004	(.008)	-.017	-.005	(.008)	-.020	-.09
Never enough time	.540	(.086)***	.188	.538	(.095)***	.173	-.02
Job autonomy	-.081	(.138)	-.018	.361	(.165)*	.076	2.05***
Job satisfaction	-.279	(.122)*	-.073	-.176	(.142)	-.044	.55
<i>Family characteristics</i>							
Household income ^a	.119	(.160)	.039	.247	(.190)	.023	.52
Missing income	-.170	(.395)	-.012	-.384	(.489)	-.023	-.34
Couple	-.074	(.195)	-.011	-.450	(.248)	-.062	-1.19
Children under 6	.488	(.191)*	.074	.549	(.173)**	.102	.24
Children 6–12	.352	(.143)*	.069	.297	(.154)*	.059	-.26
Children 13–17	.546	(.156)***	.096	.109	(.190)	.018	-1.78
<i>Company policies</i>							
Dependent care benefits availability	-.162	(.357)	-.013	.190	(.380)	.015	.68
Flextime available	-.136	(.198)	-.020	.230	(.223)	.033	1.23
<i>Workplace culture</i>							
Supervisor support regarding family	-.005	(.158)	-.001	-.203	(.178)	-.040	-.83
Family supportive environment	-.388	(.140)**	-.091	-.565	(.155)***	-.123	-.85
Easy to take time for family	-.171	(.106)	-.052	-.310	(.113)**	-.090	-.90
Frequent layoffs	.552	(.312)	.051	.258	(.338)	.023	-.64
Intercept	10.841***			9.963***			
Adjusted R ²	.108***			.103***			
Chow test F-ratio				.960			

Note: For polytomous categorical variables, the reference category is in parentheses.

^aIncome coefficients multiplied by 10,000.

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

TABLE 4. Ordinary Least Squares Standardized Regression Coefficients Predicting Negative Job-to-Home Spillover, by Sex of Respondent

Variable	Women (N = 1,245)			Men (N = 1,089)			Z
	b	S.E.	β	b	S.E.	β	
<i>Controls</i>							
Age	-.024	(.011)*	-.058	-.027	(.012)*	-.063	-.18
Education (High school or less)							
Some college	-.005	(.290)	.000	-.164	(.321)	-.015	-.39
Four-year degree or more	.734	(.368)*	.069	.448	(.386)	.044	-.54
<i>Job characteristics</i>							
Occupation (Executive/managerial)							
Professional	-.620	(.405)	-.052	-.044	(.440)	-.003	.96
Technical	-.019	(.594)	-.001	.281	(.702)	.012	.33
Sales	.012	(.479)	.001	-.404	(.500)	-.026	-.60
Administrative support	-.093	(.402)	-.008	.191	(.641)	.009	.38
Service	-.684	(.496)	-.045	-.696	(.569)	-.042	-.02
Production/operation/repair	-.197	(.521)	-.012	.117	(.462)	.012	.45
Exempt job position	.072	(.288)	.007	.848	(.316)**	.085	1.81
Hours worked per week	.075	(.010)***	.197	.050	(.010)***	.142	-1.77
Never enough time	.974	(.111)***	.232	.833	(.119)***	.191	-.87
Job autonomy	-.370	(.178)*	-.057	-.232	(.205)	-.035	.51
Job satisfaction	-.687	(.156)***	-.123	-.781	(.177)***	-.139	-.40
<i>Family characteristic</i>							
Household income ^a	-.132	(.250)	-.014	-.025	(.200)	-.003	.33
Missing income	-.327	(.508)	-.016	-.277	(.608)	-.012	.06
Couple	.791	(.251)**	.081	.280	(.308)	.027	-1.29
Children under 6	.621	(.246)**	.064	.314	(.216)	.042	-.94
Children 6–12	.681	(.184)***	.091	.200	(.191)	.028	-1.81
Children 13–17	.656	(.201)***	.079	.303	(.236)	.035	-1.14
<i>Company policies</i>							
Dependent care benefits availability	-.569	(.458)	-.031	-.212	(.473)	-.012	.54
Flextime available	-.203	(.254)	-.021	.157	(.277)	.016	.96
<i>Workplace Culture</i>							
Supervisor support regarding family	-.341	(.203)	-.051	-.541	(.221)*	-.077	-.67
Family supportive environment	-.708	(.180)***	-.114	-.663	(.193)***	-.103	.17
Easy to take time for family	-.749	(.136)***	-.156	-1.157	(.141)***	-.240	-2.08***
Frequent layoffs	1.007	(.401)**	.063	.490	(.420)	.031	-.89
Intercept		16.137***			17.823***		
Adjusted R ²		.311***			.293***		
Chow test F-ratio					1.99***		

Note: For polytomous categorical variables, the reference category is in parentheses.

^aIncome coefficients multiplied by 10,000.

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 4 reveals many similarities between women and men in the variables that predict job-to-home spillover. Time pressure on the job and working long hours have the greatest effect on job-to-home spillover for both women and men. Age also has a significant effect on job-to-home spillover for women and men; younger people experience more job-to-home spillover than do older people. Being satisfied with one's job and working in a supportive environment decrease job-to-home spillover for both. Being able to take time during the day for family eases negative job-to-home spillover for both women and men, although this effect is greater for men, as shown by its Z score in Table 4. Several variables have no effect on either women's or men's experience of negative spillover. These are occupation type, household income, and the availability of family-friendly company policies of dependent care benefits and flextime.

Family characteristics affect only women's experience of negative spillover, as illustrated by the Z scores. Being part of a couple and having more children in all age groups increases job-to-home spillover for women. In addition, fear of layoffs and having at least a college education increases job-to-home spillover for women only. For men but not for women, having an exempt job increases job-to-home spillover whereas having a supportive supervisor decreases it. With the exception noted above, the effects of all of the variables on job-to-home spillover are the same for women and men. The separate models explain a substantial portion of spillover from the job to the home, although the model is a slightly better predictor of job-to-home spillover for women (31.1 percent) than for men (29.3 percent). The Chow test F-ratio indicates that the predictors of job-to-home spillover influence women and men differently, which supports the analytic decision to estimate the model separately.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study provides compelling evidence that a family-friendly workplace culture rather than the availability of formal company policies reduces negative spillover. In family-friendly workplace climates, men as well as women find it easier to balance their jobs and family lives because their employing organizations acknowledge nonworkplace demands and do not penalize employees who attend to their lives outside of the workplace.

We empirically assessed the independent impact of workplace culture, company policies, job characteristics, and household characteristics on women's and men's experiences of negative spillover between home and job. Our study fills a gap in previous research by focusing on whether *the availability* (not use) of family-friendly benefits actually reduces negative spillover. Generally, our findings are consistent with our expectations, with some exceptions that reflect the complexities of the interrelationships among gender as a social structure, work organizations, and the larger society.

Gender theory predicts that, on an individual level, women experience greater negative spillover than do men. Our findings show that, overall, women report slightly higher levels of negative spillover in both directions than do men. The multidimensional effect of gender on negative spillover becomes clearer once workplace and family characteristics are taken into account; women experience much higher levels of job-to-home spillover

than do men, and having a domestic partner and children aggravates negative spillover for women but generally not for men. These data show how differences in work and family responsibilities between women and men persist on an individual level. Gender theory also posits that gender is not merely a characteristic of individuals; it is also a social structure that modifies the experience of negative spillover for both women and men. Our findings illuminate how the workplace is gendered male in two ways.

First, our findings point to an ongoing set of expectations that still privilege employment responsibilities over family responsibilities. They do this by consistently demonstrating the greater existence of job-to-home spillover than home-to-job spillover for both women and men. Furthermore, the gross differences between women and men in home-to-job spillover (Table 1) disappear once we account for the unique effects of respondent's sex, employment, and family characteristics. Employment, still ideologically male, warrants more attention, concern, and importance for most people than does the ideologically female domain of family life. Not only individuals, but the structural spaces, or spheres, are gendered and these gendered social spaces maintain inequalities independent of the sex of the participant. Work and family must be viewed as an interrelated *system* characterized by these gendering processes. These data support the claim that individuals do not hop back and forth between the unique and distinct social spheres of home and workplace. Rather, they are always workers, mothers, fathers, managers, daughters, administrators, sons, and laborers. As Stryker and Serpe (1983) have shown, different settings may invoke one identity over another, rendering one more salient *in that context* than others, but it does not alter the reality of coexisting multiple identities. This phenomenon occurs regardless of whether one is male or female.

Second, despite some workplaces where the culture is overtly family friendly, the workplace environment is typically *not* supportive of employees with family responsibilities. Company policies, in the absence of changed normative expectations, do not lower home-to-job spillover for either women or men, regardless of their family circumstances. A company culture that is not explicitly family friendly increases home-to-job spillover for *all* of its employees, in effect, treating them as "traditional" men who have no domestic obligations. We argue that the persistence of cultural assumptions in which the male model is the workplace model is consistent with gender theory. In other words, if we had found that family-friendly policies reduce spillover, we could conclude that while the spheres of home and work might well be viewed as separate, they are not gendered since *employee-based* policies reduced *employee* negative spillover.

Families, however, still require someone to do a variety of activities, especially caregiving. In the traditional gendered separate spheres model, women performed most of the private sphere tasks, especially the everyday chores such as meal preparation, laundry, and housecleaning, although men typically took responsibility for occasional tasks such as home repairs and automobile maintenance. In contemporary society, the vast majority of women and men participate in both spheres, albeit unequally. They both enact traditional male behavior by participating in the labor force, the work sphere. Similarly, both women and men enact traditional female behavior by being involved in home life, the private sphere. Most organizations and their incumbents, however, continue to adhere to the

hierarchical separate spheres model, as demonstrated by our findings that not only actual time spent working but also time pressure increases spillover.

Ideologically, market work is still separate from and takes priority over domestic work. Rather than moving toward an egalitarian breadwinner–caregiver model, workplace organizations, perhaps in an effort to retain that ideological advantage, seem to be clinging to a breadwinner-only model for both women and men, which leaves the caregiver role inadequately filled (Hochschild 1989). The latter is certainly an empirical question that emerges from our research here. Thus, while there is evidence of reduced gender inequality in some dimensions of social life in the form of the sex of breadwinners and caregivers, negative spillover remains in the form of the persistent gendering of market work as male and caregiving as female. This trajectory suggests a sort of perverted gender equality in which women and men experience equivalent levels of negative spillover between their jobs and their homes instead of contentedly sharing market work and caregiving.

Gender theory alone, however, does not explain another major finding—the failure of family-friendly policy to decrease negative spillover. Combining the insights of neo-institutional theory with gender theory, however, does explain our results. Scholars have repeatedly demonstrated, as neo-institutional theory suggests, the disjuncture between official policies and implicit normative orders surrounding job–family boundaries (Perin 1991; Bailyn 1993; Perlow 1997). Our findings reaffirm the observation that the superimposition of family-friendly policies in the absence of genuine supervisor support and commitment to a family-friendly workplace environment not only fails to benefit the worker, but also could be to the worker’s detriment.

Workplace cultures reflect and reinforce the culture of the wider society. The institutionalization of the separation between market work and domestic work, between job and home exemplifies this relationship. This firmly entrenched ideology is difficult to change since individuals enter workplaces with these normative expectations well institutionalized. Additionally, the notion of separate spheres is more than just an institutionalized informal practice. It was at one time strongly supported by formal policies such as legal sex discrimination, the family wage, sex-biased parental leave, and divorce settlements that automatically awarded custody to mothers and mandated financial, but not caregiving, support from fathers.

In sum, our research has made two contributions to the extant understanding of job-to-home and home-to-job spillover. Guided by both gender theory and neo-institutional theory, this study demonstrates that reducing negative job-to-home spillover in the absence of deinstitutionalizing the habituated understandings about separate spheres, family-friendly policies alone will not make an organization family friendly. A supportive workplace culture, regardless of the availability of family-friendly policies, is paramount to the successful management of job-to-home and home-to-job spillover. A second contribution is demonstrating the utility of combining gender and neo-institutional theory to understand these dynamics.

Our study also demonstrates that time pressure is a considerable obstacle to successfully managing home-to-job and especially job-to-home spillover. Time commitment to

a job is a norm that reinforces both the separate spheres ideology and gender inequity (see Epstein et al. 1999). All employees have trouble finding enough time to balance a job and a family. Yet, when women decide to do so by taking time away from the job, they conform to and thus reinforce the legitimacy of the gendered status expectations that view women as less competent employees (Ridgeway and Erickson 2000). A genuine family-friendly workplace culture and relaxed time pressure on the job are fundamental to achieving the dual objectives of job-family balance and gender equity in contemporary society.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by a grant from the Newcomb College Center for Research on Women, Tulane University.

NOTES

¹The term “work” in the job-family literature invariably represents wage labor, even though researchers acknowledge that there is much societal work besides paid labor, such as housework, child care, volunteer work, and emotion work (Daniels 1987; Tilly and Tilly 1998).

²Just as there are many variants of gender theory, there are many variants of neo-institutional theory (Powell and DiMaggio 1991).

³The point is that “flexibility” is complex in its meaning and it is not always clear for whom the flexibility is arranged.

⁴Employers often implement family-friendly policies to attract and/or retain critical constituencies of employees (Goodstein 1994; Ingram and Simons 1995), in particular parents or, more commonly, women. Because caregiving activity is not restricted to either parents or women, we do not restrict our sample to those constituencies.

⁵Each spillover index is highly reliable; Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .79 for home-to-job spillover and .86 for job-to-home spillover. Factor analysis confirms that the items in each index cluster into meaningful measures of spillover. Items in each index loaded above .69 on the single factor. Nevertheless, as a reviewer pointed out, some of the items in the indices are more subjective than others and thus might be more sensitive to interpretation by the respondents. The ubiquitous doctrine of gendered separate spheres may differentially impact not only men's and women's answers to spillover questions but might also influence the wording of the questions themselves.

⁶Ideally we would include other measures of household characteristics, demands, and pressures; the data simply do not allow it.

⁷Job-to-home spillover is also more extensive than home-to-job spillover for both women ($t = -38.917, p < .000$) and men ($t = -34.311, p < .000$) as separate groups.

⁸We also estimated the model with a subsample that included only parents (respondents with any children under 18). The benefits variables were not significant (results not shown).

⁹As pointed out by a reviewer, dependent care policies may not be equivalent in terms of their helpfulness. We therefore tested models that included the five dependent care policies as separate items rather than as an index. None of the separate dependent care benefit variables was significant (results not shown).

¹⁰We began investigating the observed differences between women and men by estimating models that included multiplicative terms for the interaction of sex with each of the workplace variables (supervisor support, frequent layoffs, family supportive environment, and ease of taking time for

family) and each of the family variables (couple and the three age groups of children). None of these interaction terms was significant, although the interaction between sex and ease of taking time for family during the day approached significance ($p = .059$). We then estimated each model by sex so that we could further explore the observed sex difference.

¹¹We used the Chow test (Chow 1960) to examine whether the covariance of Y and X is distributed differently for women than for men.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4: 139–58.
- Allen, Tammy D. 2001. "Family-Supportive Work Environments: The Role of Organizational Perceptions." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 58: 414–35.
- Bailyn, Lotte. 1993. *Breaking the Mold: Women, Men, and Time in the New Corporate Culture*. New York: Free Press.
- Barnett, Rosalind C. 1994. "Home-to-Work Spillover Revisited: A Study of Full-Time Employed Women in Dual-Earner Couples." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56: 647–56.
- . 1999. "A New Work-Life Model for the Twenty-First Century." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 562: 143–58.
- Bond, James T., Ellen Galinsky, and Jennifer E. Swanberg. 1998. *The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Bowen, Gary L. "Workplace Programs and Policies that Address Work-Family and Gender Equity Issues in the United States." Pp. 79–98 in *Organizational Change and Gender Equity: International Perspectives on Fathers and Mothers at the Workplace*, edited by Linda L. Haas, Philip Hwang, and Graeme Russell. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chow, Gregory C. 1960. "Tests of Equality between Sets of Coefficients in Two Linear Regressions." *Econometrica* 28: 591–606.
- Ciscel, David H., David C. Sharp, and Julia A. Heath. 2000. "Family Work Trends and Practices: 1971 to 1991." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 21(1): 23–36.
- Clogg, Clifford, Eva Petkova, and Adamantios Haritou. 1995. "Statistical Methods for Comparing Regression Coefficients between Models." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(5): 1261–93.
- Collinson, David L. and Margaret Collinson. 1997. "Delaying Managers: Time-Space Surveillance and Its Gendered Effects." *Organization* 4(3): 375–407.
- Collinson, David and Jeff Hearn. 1994. "Naming Men as Men: Implications for Work, Organization, and Management." *Gender, Work, and Organization* 1: 2–22.
- Connell, Robert. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1974. *Greedy Institutions*. New York: Free Press.
- Crouter, Ann C. 1984. "Spillover from Family to Work: The Neglected Side of the Work-Family Interface." *Human Relations* 37: 425–42.
- Daniels, Arlene Kaplan. 1987. "Invisible Work." *Social Problems* 35(5): 403–15.
- Deutsch, Francine M. and Susan E. Saxon. 1998. "Traditional Ideologies, Nontraditional Lives." *Sex Roles* 38(5/6): 331–62.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48: 147–60.
- . 1991. "Introduction." Pp. 1–38 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Duxbury, Linda and Christopher Higgins. 1994. "Interference between Employment and Family: A Status Report on Dual-Career and Dual-Earner Mothers and Fathers." *Employee Assistance Quarterly* 9: 55–80.
- Duxbury, Linda, Christopher Higgins, and Catherine Lee. 1994. "Work–Family Conflict: A Comparison by Gender, Family Type, and Perceived Control." *Journal of Family Issues* 15(3): 449–66.
- Eagle, Bruce W., Edward W. Miles, and Marjorie L. Icenogle. 1997. "Interrole Conflicts and the Permeability of Work and Family Domains: Are There Gender Differences?" *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 50: 168–84.
- Edwards, Jeffrey R. and Nancy P. Rothbard. 1999. "Work and Family Stress and Well-Being: An Examination of Person-Environment Fit in the Work and Family Domains." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 77: 85–129.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs, Carroll Seron, Bonnie Oglensky, and Robert Saute. 1999. *The Part-Time Paradox: Time Norms, Professional Life, Family and Gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Ferber, Marianne A., Brigid O'Farrell, and La Rue Allen. 1991. *Work and Family: Policies for a Changing Work Force*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx. 1990. "Beyond Separate Spheres: Feminism and Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 866–84.
- Fligstein, Neil. 2001. "Social Skill and the Theory of Fields." *Sociological Theory* 19(2): 105–25.
- Foster, Johanna. 1999. "An Invitation to Dialogue: Clarifying the Position of Feminist Gender Theory in Relation to Sexual Difference Theory." *Gender & Society* 13(4): 431–56.
- Frone, Michael R., Marcia Russell, and Lynne M. Cooper. 1992. "Antecedents and Outcomes of Work-Family Conflict: Testing a Model of the Work-Family Interface." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77(1): 65–78.
- Frone, Michael R., John K. Yardley, and Karen S. Markel. 1997. "Developing and Testing an Integrative Model of the Work-Family Interface." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 50: 145–67.
- Galinsky, Ellen, James T. Bond, and Dana E. Friedman. 1996. "The Role of Employers in Addressing the Needs of Employed Parents." *Journal of Social Issues* 52(3): 111–36.
- Galinsky, Ellen and Peter J. Stein. 1990. "The Impact of Human Resource Policies on Employees: Balancing Work/Family Life." *Journal of Family Issues* 11(4): 368–83.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 2000. "Gender and the Future of the Family: Implications for the Postindustrial Workplace." Pp. 11–21 in *Challenges for Work and Family in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Dana Vannoy and Paula J. Dubeck. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- . 2002. "Moral Dilemmas, Moral Strategies, and the Transformation of Gender: Lessons for Two Generations of Work and Family Change." *Gender & Society* 16: 8–28.
- Gerstel, Naomi and Dan Clawson. 2001. "Unions' Responses to Family Concerns." *Social Problems* 48(2): 277–97.
- Gherardi, Silvia. 1994. "The Gender We Think, the Gender We Do in Our Everyday Organizational Lives." *Human Relations* 47: 591–608.
- Gignac, Monique A. M., E. Kevin Kelloway, and Benjamin H. Gottlieb. 1996. "The Impact of Caregiving on Employment: A Mediation Model of Work–Family Conflict." *Canadian Journal on Aging* 15(4): 525–42.
- Glass, Jennifer. 2000. "Envisioning the Integration of Family and Work: Toward a Kinder, Gentler Workplace." *Contemporary Sociology* 29: 129–43.
- Goodstein, Jerry D. 1994. "Institutional Pressures and Strategic Responsiveness: Employer Involvement in Work–Family Issues." *Academy of Management Journal* 37(2): 350–82.

- Greenhaus, Jeffrey H. and Saroj Parasuraman. 1999. "Research on Work, Family, and Gender: Current Status and Future Directions." Pp. 391–412 in *Handbook of Gender and Work*, edited by G. N. Powell. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Grzywacz, Joseph G., David M. Almeida, and Daniel A. McDonald. 2002. "Work–Family Spillover and Daily Reports of Work and Family Stress in the Adult Labor Force." *Family Relations* 51: 28–36.
- Gutek, Barbara A., Sabrina Searle, and Lilian Klepa. 1991. "Rational versus Gender Role Expectations for Work–Family Conflict." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76(4): 560–8.
- Harrison, Bennett. 1994. *Lean and Mean: The Changing Landscape of Corporate Power in the Age of Flexibility*. New York: Basic.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking.
- Ingram, Paul and Tal Simons. 1995. "Institutional and Resource Dependence Determinants of Responsiveness Work–Family Issues." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(5): 1466–82.
- Jacobs, Jerry A. and Kathleen Gerson. 1998. "Toward a Family-Friendly, Gender-Equitable Work Week." *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Labor and Employment Law* 1(2): 457–72.
- Jepperson, Ronald L. 1991. "Institutions, Institutional Effects and Institutionalism." Pp. 143–63 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kaufman, Gayle and Peter Uhlenberg. 2000. "The Influence of Parenthood on the Work Effort of Married Men and Women." *Social Force* 78(3): 931–49.
- Kelly, Erin L. 1999. "Theorizing Corporate Family Policies: How Advocates Built 'the Business Case' for 'Family-Friendly' Policies." *Research in the Sociology of Work* 7: 169–202.
- Kirchmeyer, Catherine. 1993. "Nonwork-to-Work Spillover: A More Balanced View of the Experiences and Coping of Professional Women and Men." *Sex Roles* 28: 531–52.
- . 1995. "Managing the Work-Nonwork Boundary: An Assessment of Organizational Responses." *Human Relations* 48: 515–36.
- Kossek, Ellen Ernst, Alison E. Barber, and Deborah Winters. 1999. "Using Flexible Schedules in the Managerial World: The Power of Peers." *Human Resources Management* 38: 33–46.
- Kossek, Ellen Ernst and Cynthia Ozeki. 1998. "Work–Family Conflict, Policies, and the Job–Life Satisfaction Relationship: A Review and Directions for Organizational Behavior-Human Resources Research." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83(2): 139–49.
- Lorber, Judith. 1994. *Paradoxes of Gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey. 2003. "'Said and Done' versus 'Saying and Doing': Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender at Work." *Gender & Society* 17(3): 342–66.
- Meyer, John P. and Natalie Allen. 1997. *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(2): 340–63.
- Osterman, Paul. 1995. "Work/Family Programs and the Employment Relationship." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40(4): 681–700.
- Perin, Constance. 1991. "The Moral Fabric of the Office: Panopticon Discourse and Schedule Flexibilities." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 8: 241–68.

- Perlow, Leslie A. 1997. *Finding Time: How Corporations, Individuals, and Families Can Benefit from New Work Practices*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- . 1998. "Boundary Control: The Social Ordering of Work and Family in a High-Tech Corporation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43: 328–57.
- Potuchek, Jean L. 1997. *Who Supports the Family? Gender and Breadwinning in Dual-Earner Marriages*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Powell, Walter W. and Paul J. DiMaggio. 1991. "Introduction." Pp. 1–38 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ridgeway, Cynthia L. 1997. "Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality: Considering Employment." *American Sociological Review* 62: 218–35.
- Ridgeway, Cynthia L. and Kristan Glasgow Erickson. 2000. "Creating and Spreading Status Beliefs." *American Journal of Sociology* 106(3): 579–615.
- Risman, Barbara J. 1998. *Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Roehling, Patricia V., Mark V. Roehling, and Phyllis Moen. 2001. "The Relationship between Work–Life Policies and Practices and Employee Loyalty: A Life Course Perspective." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 22(2): 141–70.
- Rones, Philip L., Randy E. Ilg, and Jennifer M. Garner. 1997. "Trends in Hours of Work since the Mid-1970s." *Monthly Labor Review* 120(4): 3–14.
- Rubin, Beth A. 1995. "Flexible Accumulation: The Decline of Contract and Social Transformation." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 1: 297–323.
- Rubin, Beth A. 1996. *Shifts in the Social Contract: Understanding Change in American Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rubin, Beth A. and Charles J. Brody. 2002. "Insecurity, Time and Technology: Coercing Commitment in the New Economy." Paper presented at the 97th Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, August 16–19.
- Rubin, Beth A. and Brian T. Smith. 2001. "Re-Employment in the Restructured Economy: Surviving Change, Displacement and Gales of Creative Destruction." Pp. 323–42 in *Working in Restructured Workplaces: Challenges and New Directions for the Sociology of Work*, edited by Daniel Cornfield, Karen E. Campbell, and Holly J. McCammon. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sanchez, Laura and Elizabeth Thomson. 1997. "Becoming Mothers and Fathers: Parenthood, Gender, and the Division of Labor." *Gender & Society* 11(6): 747–72.
- Sandberg, Joanne C. 1999. "The Effects of Family Obligations and Workplace Resources on Men's and Women's Use of Family Leaves." *Research in the Sociology of Work* 7: 261–81.
- Schieman, Scott, Debra Branch McBrier, and Karen Van Gundy. 2003. "Home-to-Work Conflict, Work Qualities, and Emotional Distress." *Sociological Forum* 18: 137–64.
- Scott, Joan W. 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91(5): 1053–75.
- Small, Stephen A. and Dave Riley. 1990. "Toward a Multidimensional Assessment of Work Spillover into Family Life." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 51–61.
- South, Scott J. and Glenna Spitze. 1994. "Housework in Marital and Non-Marital Households." *American Sociological Review* 59: 327–47.
- Stryker, Sheldon and Richard T. Serpe. 1983. "Toward a Theory of Family Influence in the Socialization of Children." *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization* 4: 47–71.

- Thomas, Linda Thiede and Daniel C. Ganster. 1995. "Impact of Family-Supportive Work Variables on Work-Family Conflict and Strain: A Control Perspective." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80: 9-15.
- Thompson, Cynthia A., Laura L. Beauvais, and Karen S. Lyness. 1999. "When Work-Family Benefits Are Not Enough: The Influence of Work-Family Culture on Benefit Utilization, Organizational Attachment, and Work-Family Conflict." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 54: 392-415.
- Thompson, Linda and Alexis J. Walker. 1989. "Gender in Families: Women and Men in Marriage, Work, and Parenthood." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51: 845-71.
- Thornton, Arland. 1989. "Changing Attitudes toward Family Issues in the United States." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51: 873-93.
- Tilly, Chris and Charles Tilly. 1998. *Work and Capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Vallas, Steven P. 1999. "Rethinking Post-Fordism: The Meaning of Workplace Flexibility." *Sociological Theory* 1: 68-101.
- Wajcman, Judy. 1999. *Managing Like a Man: Women and Men in Corporate Management*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Warren, Jennifer A. and Phyllis J. Johnson. 1995. "The Impact of Workplace Support on Work-Family Role Strain." *Family Relations* 44: 163-9.
- Wiatrowski, William J. 1990. "Family-Related Benefits in the Workplace." *Monthly Labor Review* 113(3): 28-33.
- Williams, Kevin and George M. Alliger. 1994. "Role Stressors, Mood Spillover, and Perceptions of Work-Family Conflict in Employed Parents." *Academy of Management Journal* 37: 837-68.
- Witkowski, Kristine M. 1999. "Becoming Family-Friendly: Work-Family Program Innovation among the Largest U.S. Corporations." *Research in the Sociology of Work* 7: 203-32.
- Zucker, Lynne G. 1991. "The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence." Pp. 83-107 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. Variables and Measurement

Variables	Measurement
<i>Dependent variables</i>	
Home-to-job spillover index	5 (never) to 25 (very often) Cronbach's alpha: .79 <i>How often has your family or personal life:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • kept you from getting work done on time at your job? • kept you from taking on extra work at your job? • kept you from doing as good a job at work as you could? • drained you of the energy you needed to do your job? • kept you from concentrating on your job?

APPENDIX A. (Continued)

Variables	Measurement
Job-to-home spillover index	5 (never) to 25 (very often) Cronbach's alpha: .86 <i>In the past three months, how often have you _____ because of your job?:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not had enough time for yourself • not had enough time for your family or other important people in your life • not had the energy to do things with your family or other important people in your life • not been able to get everything done at home each day • not been in as good a mood as you would like to be at home
<i>Independent variables</i>	
<i>Controls</i>	
Age	Age, in years
Education	Education level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school or less • Some college • Four-year college degree or more
<i>Job Characteristics</i>	
Occupation	Category of occupation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive, administrators, managers • Professionals • Sales • Administrative support • Service • Production, operations, repair
Exempt job position	0 nonexempt, 1 exempt
Hours worked per week	Number of paid hours usually worked per week at main job, number of paid and unpaid overtime hours usually worked per week at main job, and number of paid hours worked at all other jobs
Never enough time	1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) I never seem to have enough time to get everything done on my job.
Job autonomy index	1 (low autonomy) to 4 (high autonomy) Cronbach's alpha: .67 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have the freedom to decide what I do on my job.

APPENDIX A. (Continued)

Variables	Measurement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done. • I have a lot of say about what happens on my job.
Job satisfaction indicator	1 (not satisfied at all) to 4 (very satisfied)
<i>Family Characteristics</i>	
Couple	0 not a member of a couple, 1 member of a couple
Household income	Total household income in 1996
Children under 6	Number of children under 6 years of age in the household
Children 6–12	Number of children ages 6 through 12 in the household
Children 13–17	Number of children ages 13 through 17 in the household
<i>Company Policies</i>	
Dependent care benefits index	0 (no benefits) to 1 (all benefits) Cronbach's alpha: .70 <i>Does your employer:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have a program or service that helps employees find child care if they need it, or not? • have a program that helps employees get information about elder care or find services for elderly relatives if they need them, or not? • operate or sponsor a child care center for the children of employees at or near your location, or not? • provide employees with any direct financial assistance for child care—that is, vouchers, cash, or scholarships, or not? • have a program that allows employees to put part of their income BEFORE TAXES in an account that can be used to pay for child care or other dependent care? These programs are sometimes called “cafeteria plans” or “dependent care assistance plans.”
Flexitime available	0 no, 1 yes

APPENDIX A. (Continued)

Variables	Measurement
<i>Workplace Culture</i>	
Supervisor support re: family index	<p>1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) Cronbach's alpha: .86</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My supervisor is fair and doesn't show favoritism in responding to employees' personal or family needs. • My supervisor accommodates me when I have family or personal business to take care of—for example, medical appointments, meeting with child's teacher, etc. • My supervisor is understanding when I talk about personal or family issues that affect my work. • I feel comfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my supervisor. • My supervisor really cares about the effects that work demands have on my personal and family life.
Family supportive environment index	<p>1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree) Cronbach's alpha: .74.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an unwritten rule at my place of employment that you can't take care of family needs on company time. • At my place of employment, employees who put their family or personal needs ahead of their jobs are not looked on favorably. • If you have a problem managing your work and family responsibilities, the attitude at my place of employment is "You made your bed, now lie in it!" • At my place of employment, employees have to choose between advancing in their jobs or devoting attention to their family or personal lives.
Easy to take time during workday for family matters	0 (not very easy) to 4 (very easy)
Frequent layoffs when work slow	0 no, 1 yes

APPENDIX B. Correlations between all Variables in the Analysis (N = 2,334)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	
(1) Woman																						
(2) Dep Benefits	.00																					
(3) Flextime	-.04*	.12**																				
(4) Spvsr Sprt	.03	.11**	.15**																			
(5) Layoffs	.00	-.08**	-.03	-.10**																		
(6) Sprtve Env	.05*	.07**	.19**	.44**	-.09**																	
(7) Time off	.04	.09**	.21**	.39**	-.11**	.36**																
(8) Occupation	-.15**	-.14**	-.24**	-.08**	.15**	-.17**	-.05**															
(9) Exempt	.00	.06**	.16**	.03	-.12**	.10**	.01	-.48**														
(10) Hours	-.24**	.07**	.03	-.05*	-.11**	-.04*	-.08**	-.10**	.19**													
(11) Time pressure	-.01	.06**	.07**	-.05**	-.05*	-.09**	-.12**	-.20**	.24**	.22**												
(12) Autonomy	-.08**	.09**	.28**	.33**	-.11**	.27**	.27**	-.21**	.17**	.08**	.08**											
(13) Job Satis	.03	.12**	.12**	.45**	-.15**	.25**	.30**	-.11**	.04	-.02	-.04*	.36**										
(14) Couple	-.10**	.00	.04*	.06**	-.03	.06**	.02	-.04	.07**	.03	.06**	.08**	.07**									
(15) Kids <6	-.10**	-.00	-.02	-.04	.01	.01	-.03	.04	-.03	.05*	.01	-.02	-.04*	.20**								
(16) Kids 6-12	-.02	-.01	-.04*	-.00	.00	.02	-.03	.02	-.01	.06**	.01	.03	.00	.15**	.12**							
(17) Kids 13-17	.03	-.00	-.00	.01	.00	.01	-.05*	-.01	.00	-.01	.03	-.00	.02	.10**	-.11**	.08**						
(18) Income	-.07**	.10**	.12**	.01	-.09**	.06**	.05*	-.18**	.14**	.12**	.13**	.12**	.06**	.22**	.03	.01	.02					
(19) Age	.08**	-.00	-.03	.06**	-.09**	.01	.08**	-.05*	.09**	-.03	.05**	.04	.07**	.12**	-.25**	-.11**	.09**	.07**				
(20) Education	-.02	.12**	.17**	.03	-.12**	.13**	.02	-.52**	.40**	.11**	.18**	.12**	.03	.03	.01	-.07**	-.02	.23**	.01			
(21) H-to-J Spill	.04*	.01	-.00	-.12**	.04*	-.15**	-.16**	-.10**	.09**	.05*	.23**	-.02	-.12**	-.01	.09**	.07**	.05**	.06**	-.07**	.11**		
(22) J-to-H Spill	.04	-.04	-.07**	-.28**	.08**	-.27**	-.37	-.06**	.11**	.23**	.31**	-.16**	.29**	.05*	.09**	.09**	.07**	.02	-.10**	.08**	.42*	

*Denotes correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Denotes correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).